

REMARKS

This paper is submitted in response to the Final Office Action dated April 10, 2008 (the “Final Office Action”). Claims 38-70, 111, 113-124, 126-137, 139-150, 152-163, 165-177, 179-191, 193-205, and 207-218 are pending in the application.

Claims 38-53, 55-70, 111, 113-124, 126-137, 139-150, 152-163, 165-177, 179-191, 193-205, and 207-218 stand rejected.

Claim 54 is under objection.

Claims 38-52 and 55-68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,649,108 issued to Spiegel et al. (“Spiegel”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,455,865 issued to Perlman (“Perlman”). Claims 111, 113-124, 126-137, 139-150, 152-163, 165-177, 179-191, 193-205, and 207-218 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as purportedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,490,246 issued to Fukushima et al. (“Fukushima”). Claims 126-136, 139-149, 179-190, and 193-204 stand rejected under § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over Fukushima. Claims 53, 69, and 70 stand rejected under § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over Spiegel in view of Fukushima. Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are allowable in view of the remarks presented herein.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Final Office Action indicates that Claim 54 under objection, and indicates that claim 54 presents allowable subject matter. Applicant is grateful for the indication of allowability for claim 54.

**Facial Shortcomings of the Pending Rejections of Claims 40-48, 52, 66-68,
113-123, 126-136, 139-149, 152-162, 165-176, 179-190, 193-204, and 207-218**

The pending rejections suffer, on their face, from a number of fatal shortcomings because they fail to discuss or even mention the limitations that are included in a number of Applicant's pending claims.

Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations provides:

In rejecting claims for want of novelty or for obviousness, the examiner must cite the best references at his or her command. When a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable. The pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified.

37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c)(2). (Emphasis added.)

Applicant respectfully submits that the particular parts of the cited references that the Final Office Action has relied upon have not been designated as nearly as practicable, as required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c)(2). In particular, the Final Office Action does not even attempt to discuss the various limitations in Applicant's dependent claims 40-48, 52, 66-68, 113-123, 126-136, 139-149, 152-162, 165-176, 179-190, 193-204, and 207-218.

With regard to the numerous limitations that are set forth in these dependent claims, the Final Office Action summarily states, without any reasoned discussion of the limitations and cited art, the following unsupported conclusions regarding the rejections under §§ 102(e) or 103(a).

- **“In claims 40-48, 52, the limitations of these claims have been addressed in claim 38.”** Final Office Action at 5.

- **“Claims 66-68 have been addressed in claim 38.”** Final Office Action at 6.
- **“Claims 113-123, 152-162, 165-176 and 207-218 are rejected because they depend on their parent claims.”** Final Office Action at 7.
- **“Claims 126-136, 139-149, 179-190 and 193-204 are rejected because they depend on their parent claims 124, 137, 177 and 191 respectively.”** Final Office Action at 8.

No additional remarks are presented in the Final Office Action to support these conclusions. Applicant notes that these rejections, on their face, fall short of the standards for rejections under §§ 102(e) or 103(a), such as the requirements that are explicitly set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c)(2). In particular, Applicant notes that “because they depend on their parent claims” is certainly not a reasoned explanation for a rejection of dependent claims under §§ 102(e) or 103(a), because this explanation explicitly ignores the additional limitations that are presented in the dependent claims.

Not only are independent claims 38, 111, 124, 137, 150, 163, 177, 191, and 205 allowable for at least the reasons discussed subsequently, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 40-48, 52, 66-68, 113-123, 126-136, 139-149, 152-162, 165-176, 179-190, 193-204, and 207-218 each set forth limitations that, in combination with the base claims and any intermediate claims on which they depend, are allowable over the cited references. If the Examiner wishes to provide grounds for the rejections of any of claims 40-48, 52, 66-68, 113-123, 126-136, 139-149, 152-162, 165-176, 179-190, 193-204, and 207-218, Applicant respectfully notes that any new grounds for rejection must be presented in a subsequent non-final Office action, in accordance with MPEP § 706.07(a), since the new grounds of rejection are not being necessitated by an amendment of the claims by Applicant, or by a suitable Information

Disclosure Statement. Moreover, Applicant notes that only a non-final Office action could provide Applicant an adequate opportunity to respond to the new rejections with explanations or amendments.

Rejections under § 103(a) over Spiegel and Perlman

Claims 38-52 and 55-68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over Spiegel in view of Perlman. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are allowable because a person having ordinary skill in the art would not make the proposed combination of references, and further because the cited portions of the references, whether taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose each limitation of Applicant's claims.

For example, independent claim 38 recites:

38. A method comprising:

transmitting a protocol packet from an origin node to a target node, wherein

said protocol packet is sent from an origin node to a target node,

said protocol packet is broadcast to a plurality of neighbors of said origin node to find said target node,

said protocol packet is configured to record a protocol packet path history from said origin node to said target node, and

said protocol packet path history comprises information regarding a topology of at least a portion of said network.

(Emphasis added.)

The cited portions of Spiegel do not disclose, or fairly suggest, the transmission of a protocol packet that “is broadcast to a plurality of neighbors of said origin node to find said target node.” Perlman discusses the concept of “flooding” to broadcast packets over a network:

Broadcasting consists of sending a packet to every node on the network.

One method of broadcasting packets over the network is called flooding. Flooding requires each node which receives a packet to transmit it to each of its neighboring nodes, except the node from which it was received. Copies of the packet eventually travel throughout the network to every node over every communication link. Typically multiple copies of the packet reach every node.

Perlman at 1:43-52.

However, Perlman notes that broadcasting is an alternative to a more direct communication between nodes. "Packets may be transmitted from a given source node to a given destination node either by broadcasting the packet over the entire network or by routing the packet along a specific group of nodes connecting the source to the destination." *Id.* at 1:39-43. Perlman describes an alternative to broadcasting, called "path specific routing":

Alternatively, a packet may be sent to a destination node via a single route. Typically the source node launches a packet to a destination node by providing a neighbor node with the packet and with information regarding its destination. The neighbor, and each subsequent node which receives the packet, makes an independent decision as to the next node to which the packet should be forwarded in order to reach the destination specified by the source.

Perlman at 1:53-60.

Perlman further notes that path specific routing has advantages over broadcast flooding:

Such routing (called path specific routing) is less costly than flooding because it avoids redundant transmissions; but if a single node along the specified path fails to forward the packet, the destination node will not receive it. In flooding, conversely, individual node failures will not prevent delivery of a packet as long as a complete functioning path connects the source and destination.

Perlman at 1:61-67.

Perlman's alternative to broadcast flooding—the “path specific routing”—is similar to the technique that is used by Spiegel, the other reference cited in the Final Office Action.

Spiegel describes detailed tools for deciding in advance on a “source route” that should be taken by a packet through a network:

All source nodes and all intermediate nodes capable of rerouting use their maps of the network topology to compute routing tables, which list one or more source routes for every possible destination address. The routing tables are used to choose source routes for connection setup packets, based on the destination address and QOS (quality of service) classes.

Spiegel at 1:47-53.

Perlman's broadcasting—which transmits multiple redundant packets from one node through a parallel set of paths throughout a network to a destination node—would be an awkward, wasteful, and counterintuitive technique for use in Spiegel's system. Spiegel takes significant pains and uses elaborate tools to enable the use of source routing—which uses a single predetermined path for communication between two nodes. For example, Spiegel employs maps of network topology, as described in the above-quoted passage, and stores these maps in various nodes in order to compute routing tables with source routes for the various possible destination addresses. Spiegel specifically uses these routing tables to choose the source routes for connection setup packets. *Id.* at 1:50-53. The chosen source route for a connection setup packet is written into source route field 33 of the packet. *Id.* at 7:4-10.

A person having ordinary skill in the art would readily understand that the purpose of choosing source routes in Spiegel is to avoid the unnecessary and wasteful flooding of packets throughout a network that the broadcast of such packets represents. Spiegel uses a directed transmission of its connection setup packets to steer clear of the broadcast flooding that is

described in Perlman. The advantage of this approach is even recognized by Perlman, which notes that “path specific routing[] is less costly than flooding because it avoids redundant transmissions” (Perlman at 1:61-62).

The proposed modification of Spiegel with the broadcasting of Perlman would eliminate the need for the detailed procedures teachings for source routing that are described in Spiegel. This modification would not only hinder the operation of Spiegel, but would eviscerate the need for these detailed teachings of Spiegel.

Indeed, a person having ordinary skill in the art would understand that the detailed operations of evaluating possible source routes one after another in Spiegel would be meaningless and useless if Spiegel instead used Perlman’s simultaneous broadcast “to every node on the network” (1:43-44). Spiegel teaches and sets forth a detailed procedure by which possible paths through a network are evaluated one at a time to determine if they are adequate. Upon failure of a particular path to provide a desired connection in Spiegel, a new packet may later be generated and transmitted along a new recommended path. (See. e.g., Spiegel at 11:55—12:17.)

This detailed procedure, which is elaborated in columns 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 (among others) and in FIGs. 7A-7D (among others) of Spiegel, would be unnecessary if Spiegel were to broadcast connection setup packets. With the broadcasting, all of Spiegel’s routes would be evaluated concurrently, and there would be no need for the deliberate one-after-another evaluation procedures. A person having ordinary skill in the art would readily understand that Spiegel teaches and uses these elaborate evaluation procedures intentionally, and therefore wishes to avoid a broadcast technique. As mentioned above, one reason for avoiding such a

broadcast technique is recognized in Perlman: flooding a network with packets is more costly because it relies on redundant transmissions.

Whatever the reason for avoiding the broadcast flooding, it is clear that Spiegel's tools are used in an environment that does avoid this flooding because Spiegel's teachings are neither needed nor helpful in an environment where a broadcast flooding would concurrently evaluate multiple possible routes. A person having ordinary skill in the art using the teachings of Spiegel would do so with a deliberate goal of avoiding flooding. This skilled person would therefore not make the proposed modification of using Perlman's broadcast flooding, since doing so would cause the system to fail this goal.

At least for this reason, claim 38 and all claims dependent therefrom are allowable under § 103(a).

Dependent claims 40-48, 52, and 66-68.

As discussed above, the Final Office Action does not address each limitation of claims 40-48, 52, and 66-68, which stand rejected under § 102(b). On p. 5, the Final Office Action simply asserts that the limitations of these claims "have been addressed in claim 38." Applicant notes that a number of limitations in claims 40-48, 52, and 66-68 are not addressed in the Final Office Action's discussion of claim 38, or in any other part of the Final Office Action. For example, claim 40 sets forth the use of "a flush indicator field." This limitation is simply not discussed in the Final Office Action; nor is such a concept to be found in the cited references.

The Final Office Action thus fails to establish that each of the limitations of claims 40-48, 52, and 66-68 are present in the cited reference because the Final Office Action does not discuss the limitations set forth in these dependent claims. At least for this reason, the Final Office

Action fails to establish that claims 40-48, 52, and 66-68 are anticipated by the cited portions of the reference.

If the Examiner maintains the rejections of these claims by introduces new grounds of rejection, Applicant respectfully notes that those grounds must be presented in a subsequent non-final Office Action, in accordance with MPEP § 706.07(a), since the new grounds of rejection would not be necessitated by Applicant's amendment of the claims or a suitable Information Disclosure Statement, and so that Applicant may have a full opportunity to respond to the rejection.

Rejections under § 102(e) over Fukushima

Claims 111, 113-124, 126-137, 139-150, 152-163, 165-177, 179-191, 193-205, and 207-218 stand rejected under 102(e) as purportedly being anticipated by Fukushima. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are allowable because the cited portions of the reference fail to disclose each limitation of the claims.

Independent claims 111, 124, 137, and 150.

For example, independent claim 111 recites:

111. A method of processing a get link state advertisement packet comprising:
 receiving said get link state advertisement packet at a downstream node, wherein
 said get link state advertisement packet is sent by a sending node,
 said get link state advertisement packet comprises at least one node identifier,
 said at least one node identifier identifies a node in a network for which said
 sending node seeks a link state advertisement, and
 said downstream node and said sending node are nodes in said network;

sending at least one link state advertisement from said downstream node to said sending node; and
sending an acknowledgement of said at least one link state advertisement to said downstream node.

(Emphasis added.)

The cited portions of Fukushima do not disclose, or fairly suggest, that at least one node identifier identifies a node for which a sending node “seeks” a link state advertisement. With regard to this limitation, the Final Office Action on pp. 3 and 6 cites the following portions of Fukushima:

If a router receives a Hello packet, which includes its own ID, from another router that the router has been aware of, on the understanding that the two routers have become aware of each other, the two routers exchange network link-state information by sending routing protocol packets.

Network link-state information includes the ID of the advertising router, the identity of the network to which the advertising router is connected, the addresses of the interfaces through which the advertising router is connected to the networks, and the costs of the interfaces. The cost of an interface means the cost which is incurred when the interface is used to forward packets and which is set by the network administrator.

(Fukushima at 1:55-67.)

Meanwhile, each router, while it transmits or receives Hello packets and network link-state information, manages the states of other routers on the network to which this router is connected and also manages the states of the interfaces through which this router is connected to networks. With regard to the states of routers, each router manages the routers' ID's, and checks if each of those routers is aware of this router, or checks if each of those routers has completed the transmission and reception of network link-state information. With regard to interface state, each router manages the addresses of the interfaces and other routers connected to a network to which an interface is connected.

A list of other routers, which is included in a Hello packet, is prepared according to the states of routers and the states of interfaces mentioned above.

Each router monitors the active modes of the other routers according to information from Hello packets it receives. More specifically, if there is any other router from which the router has not received Hello packets for longer than a fixed period, the router decides that a failure has occurred in this other router.

(Fukushima at 2:10-32.)

These passages from Fukushima teach that routers can transmit Hello packets and that two routers can exchange network link-state information by sending routing protocol packets. This network link-state information includes the ID of the advertising router, the identity of the network to which the advertising router is connected, the addresses of the interfaces through which the advertising router is connected to the networks, and the costs incurred when the interface is used to forward packets. These cited passages from Fukushima also teach that each router checks if each other router on the network, to which the router is connected, is aware of the router, or checks if each of those routers has completed the transmission and reception of network link-state information.

However, these teachings fall short of disclosing the limitations of Applicant's claim 111. In particular, there is no indication in Fukushima that the Hello packet identifies a node for which a sending node seeks a link state advertisement.

As set forth on p. 17 of Applicant's originally filed Specification, one implementation of a link state advertisement describes the state of a node's links. For example, the link state advertisement may contain "a list of the node's neighbors, links, the capacity of those links, the quality of service available on over links, one or more costs associated with each of the links, and other pertinent information."

Even if the Fukushima system employs a link state advertisement (and Applicant does not concede this point), the cited passages do not disclose that a node seeks a link state advertisement from a particular other node through the cited Hello packets (or through any other packets). More particularly, the cited material does not teach that the Fukushima Hello packets (or any other packets) are employed by a sending node that “seeks” a link state advertisement from another node. And further, the cited material certainly does not teach that the Hello packets (or any other packets) identify the node “for which said sending node seeks a link state advertisement.” These limitations are therefore absent from Fukushima.

At least for these reasons, independent claim 111 and all claims dependent therefrom are allowable under § 102(e). At least for similar reasons, independent claims 124, 137, and 150, and all claims dependent therefrom are also all allowable under § 102(e).

Independent claims 163, 177, 191, and 205.

As another example, independent claim 163 recites:

163. A method comprising:

receiving a hello packet at a downstream node, wherein said hello packet comprises a link state advertisement;

processing said link state advertisement, wherein processing said link state advertisement includes sending said link state advertisement from said downstream node; and

sending an acknowledgement from said downstream node, wherein said acknowledgement acknowledges all link state advertisements in said hello packet.

(Emphasis added.)

Claim 163 includes receiving a hello packet at a downstream node. The received hello packet includes a link state advertisement. Claim 163 also includes limitations of processing said link state advertisement, which includes sending the link state advertisement “from said

downstream node.” Claim 163 also includes sending an acknowledgement “from said downstream node.” With regard to these limitations, the Final Office Action cites features of FIG. 8 and the following passages from Fukushima:

The RP packet transmission-reception module 14, when it is started, transmits routing protocol packets, such as Hello packets, onto the networks directly connected to the multiplex router 10, and receives routing protocol packets from other routers (step 121). If a received packet has come from a neighboring router, the module 14 checks whether the presence of which has been or has not been recognized (step 122). If the presence of which has not been recognized, the module 14 notifies the protocol information manager module 15 of the newly-detected neighboring router (step 123). If the presence of which has been recognized (step 124), the module 14 sends this network link-state information to the protocol information manager module 15 (step 125).

FIG. 9 shows the procedure of the process steps of the protocol information manager module 15 in the route calculation unit 11 in the active mode.

In this process, the protocol information manager module 15 receives information from the RP packet transmission-reception module 14, and checks if information received is network link-state information (step 131). If the information is not network link-state information, in other words, if the information is about a neighboring router, the module 15 generates neighboring router state 24 and interface state 23 from information received (step 132). On the other hand, if the information is network link-state information, the module 15 checks if the information received agrees with the contents of the link-state data base 22 (step 133).

(Fukushima at 10:19-46.)

The Final Office Action appears to equate Applicant’s link state advertisement with Fukushima’s routing protocol packet, and to equate Applicant’s downstream node with Fukushima’s multiplex router 10. Even if this characterization of Fukushima is correct (and Applicant does not concede this point), the cited portions of the references fail to disclose each limitation of claim 163.

The above-quoted portions of Fukushima, and the accompanying features in the figures, teach that a multiplex router 10 can transmit routing protocol packets, such as Hello packets, onto the networks directly connected to the multiplex router 10, and can receive routing protocol packets from other routers. However, these passages do not describe any other transmission between routers. The material on which the Examiner relies is merely a description of messages within a particular router: the cited teachings only discuss various communications within multiplex router 10. For example, transmission-reception module 14 notifies protocol information manager module 15 of a newly-detected router. Module 14 also sends network link-state information to module 15. However, reference to Fukushima's FIG. 1 and 2 clearly show that these latter communications are wholly within multiplex router 10, which the Final Office Action equates with Applicant's downstream node. Thus, these cited communications could not, and would not, be seen by a person having ordinary skill in the art as being communications "from" Applicant's downstream node. Accordingly, they do not meet Applicant's limitations of "sending said link state advertisement from said downstream node" and "sending an acknowledgement from said downstream node."

At least for these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 163 and all claims dependent therefrom are allowable under § 103(a). At least for similar reasons, independent claims 177, 191, and 205 and all claims dependent therefrom are also allowable under § 103(a).

Dependent claims 113-123, 152-162, 165-176, and 207-218.

As discussed above, the Final Office Action is silent regarding the limitations of Applicant's dependent claims 113-123, 152-162, 165-176, and 207-218, which stand rejected

under § 102(e). The Final Office Action merely states on p. 7 that these claims “are rejected because they depend on their parent claims.” The Final Office Action appears to have misapplied the standards of patentability under § 102(e) with regard to these claims.

The rejections of these claims are improper because they are not supported by any valid reasoning under §§ 102(e). In particular, the Final Office Action does not even appear to assert that any of the limitations of the dependent claims may be found in the cited reference.

Applicant respectfully submits that these dependent claims are allowable under § 102(e), because the Final Office Action fails to set forth any reasoning in support of these rejections, and further because Applicant does not find the limitations of these claims in the cited portions of the references.

If the Examiner provides grounds for the rejections of claims 113-123, 152-162, 165-176, and 207-218, Applicant respectfully notes that those grounds must be presented in a subsequent non-final Office Action, in accordance with MPEP § 706.07(a), since the new grounds of rejection would not be necessitated by Applicant’s amendment of the claims or a suitable Information Disclosure Statement, and so that Applicant may have a full opportunity to respond to the rejection.

Dependent claims 126-136, 139-149, 179-190, and 193-204.

The Final Office Action states on p. 6 that claims 126-136, 139-149, 179-190, and 193-204, are among the claims rejected under § 102(e) as being anticipated by Fukushima. However, the Final Office Action does not provide any support for the § 102(e) rejections of these claims, and does not cite any portions of the reference as teaching the limitations of these claims. (These

claims are also under rejection based on § 103(a); those rejections are discussed separately below.)

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 126-136, 139-149, 179-190, and 193-204 are patentable under § 102(e) by virtue of having limitations that are not disclosed in Fukushima.

If the Examiner provides arguments supporting the § 102(e) rejections of claims 126-136, 139-149, 179-190, and 193-204, Applicant respectfully notes that those arguments must be presented in a subsequent non-final Office Action, in accordance with MPEP § 706.07(a), since the new grounds of rejection would not be necessitated by Applicant's amendment of the claims or a suitable Information Disclosure Statement, and so that Applicant may have a full opportunity to respond to the rejection.

Rejections under § 103(a) over Fukushima

The Final Office Action states on p. 8 that claims 126-136, 139-149, 179-190, and 193-204 stand rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukushima.

As discussed above, the Final Office Action is silent regarding the limitations of Applicant's dependent claims 126-136, 139-149, 179-190, and 193-204. The Final Office Action merely states on p. 8 that these claims "are rejected because they depend on their parent claims." The Final Office Action appears to have misapplied the standards of patentability under § 103(a) with regard to these claims.

The rejections of these claims are improper because they are not supported by any valid reasoning under § 103(a). In particular, the Final Office Action does not even appear to assert that any of the limitations of the dependent claims may be found in the cited references. Applicant respectfully submits that these dependent claims are allowable under § 103(a), because

the Final Office Action fails to set forth any reasoning in support of these rejections, and further because Applicant does not find the limitations of these claims in the cited portions of the references.

If the Examiner provides grounds for the rejections of claims 126-136, 139-149, 179-190, and 193-204, Applicant respectfully notes that those grounds must be presented in a subsequent non-final Office Action, in accordance with MPEP § 706.07(a), since the new grounds of rejection would not be necessitated by Applicant's amendment of the claims or a suitable Information Disclosure Statement, and so that Applicant may have a full opportunity to respond to the rejection.

Rejections under § 103(a) over Spiegel and Fukushima

Dependent claims 53, 69, and 70 stand rejected under § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over Spiegel in view of Fukushima. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are allowable because the cited portions of the reference fail to disclose each limitation of the claims, and because that which the Examiner asserts to be well known is not.

First, Applicant notes that the shortcomings of Spiegel discussed above with respect to independent claim 38 are not remedied in Fukushima. Thus, the above remarks regarding claim 38 apply with equal force to claims 53, 69, and 70, which depend on claim 38.

In addition, the Final Office Action asserts Official notice on p. 8 of certain features of Applicant's claims as purportedly being "well-known." Applicant respectfully submits that the teachings in question are not sufficiently well known for the application of Official Notice.

In particular, Applicant disagrees with the assertion on p. 8 of the Final Office Action that:

it is well-known skill in the art that when a link or router is down, a protocol packet such as a link down packet is transmitted to the sender router to notify that the router has been down.

Applicant respectfully submits that that which the Final Office Action asserts to be well-known is not. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection that relies on this assertion of “well-known” features is ungrounded. (If it is the Examiner’s position that the rejection is based on a personal knowledge that these limitations are well-known, Applicant requests that the facts be supported by an affidavit from the Examiner in accordance with MPEP § 2144.03(C) and 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(d)(2).) Applicant’s claims 69 and 70 are therefore patentable under § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that all claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. Applicant also hereby authorizes that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AE, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia, 22313-1450, on June 10, 2008.



Attorney for Applicant

2008 Jun 10

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Cyrus F. Bharucha
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 42,324
Telephone: (512) 439-5097
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099